

**REMARKS**

In this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 19, 21 and 23, cancel claims 18, 20 and 24, without prejudice, and add new claims 30 and 31. Additionally in this Response, Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejections. Applicants respectfully suggest that the amendments and the new claims materially reduce and/or simplify issues in the application and place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Additionally, Applicants respectfully suggest that no additional search is required in that the amendments to the claims incorporate features previously considered by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the amendments be entered and that the rejections be reconsidered.

Applicants' silence with regard to the Examiner's rejections of dependent claims constitutes a recognition by the Applicants that the rejections are moot based on Applicants' Remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or a subsequent application. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-7, 9-17, 19 and 21-23 and 25-31 are pending in the present application.

**Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 15, 23-25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Resnick (U.S. Patent No. 5,910,188) in view of Blaine (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,970). The Examiner then rejected claims 5, 10-13 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Resnick in view of Blaine and further in view of Haynes (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,157). The Examiner next rejected claims 14, 16-19 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Resnick in view of Blaine and further in view of Macke, Sr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,282). Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 21, 22 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Resnick and Blaine in view of Macke, Sr. et al. and further in view of Lutke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,476).

The Examiner also objected to claim 20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, indicating claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for recognizing the allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants amend claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 20 and intervening claim 18. Thus, claim 1 is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested. Claims 19 and 21 are amended to depend from claim 1 and claims 18 and 20 are cancelled, without prejudice. Claims 2-7, 9-17, 19, 21 and 22 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable at least by dependency. New claim 30 recites a method corresponding to the system recited in claim 1 and is thus in condition for allowance.

In the rejection of claims 2 and 24, the Examiner states that Resnick discloses a third conductive element connected to a ground plane and surrounding at least part of the at least one first and second conductive elements (reference numeral 36 of Fig. 4 and col. 4, lines 38-45). The rejection of claim 2 is moot in light of the amendment to claim 1, as provided in the above remarks. Applicants amend claim 23 to include the limitations of claim 24 and cancel claim 24, without prejudice.

Claim 23, as amended, recites *at least partially circumscribing an area about the at least one first conductive element and the at least one second conductive element with a third conductive element connected to a ground plane*, where the first and second conductive elements are *axially separated*. Resnick discloses the second conductor 28' coaxially located in the surrounding first conductor 26'. The first conductor 26' is fixed in slot 36' of mounting bracket 32'. Neither the mounting bracket 32' nor the slot 36' referenced by the Examiner circumscribe an area about the first and second axially separated conductive elements. Neither Resnick nor any of the other cited references teach or suggest all of the features of claim 23. Applicants respectfully suggest that amended claim 23 is in condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the rejection. Claims 25-29 depend from claim 23 and are allowable at least by dependency. New claim 31 recites a system corresponding to the method recited in claim 23 and is thus in condition for allowance.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants believe this Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action. Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of the application.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert W. Gauthier, Reg. No. 35,153  
Attorney for Applicants  
Tel. No. (617) 832-1175  
Fax. No. (617) 832-7000

Date: August 10, 2005  
**Customer No: 25181**  
Patent Group  
Foley Hoag, LLP  
155 Seaport Blvd.  
Boston, MA 02210-2600